



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

Karel BOSTIK  
15116 - 86 Street  
EDMONTON AB T5E 5X6  
CANADA

**COPY MAILED**

**NOV 13 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:	
Karel BOSTIK	:	
Application No. 10/806,360	:	DECISION ON RENEWED PETITION
Filed: March 23, 2004	:	UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.181(A)
Title: SHEAR COUPLING	:	

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed September 18, 2006, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a), to revive the above-identified application.

Receipt of both a copy of the letter of June 29, 2004 and the previously deficient fee amount is acknowledged.

BACKGROUND

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the Notice of Missing Parts (notice), mailed June 7, 2004, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of two months. No response was received, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) were requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on August 8, 2004. A notice of abandonment was mailed on March 29, 2006.

With the original petition, Petitioner asserted that a reply to the notice was mailed on June 29, 2004.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The original petition was filed on May 15, 2006, and was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on August 15, 2006.

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE C.F.R.

37 C.F.R. §1.8(b) sets forth, *in toto*:

(b) In the event that correspondence is considered timely filed by being mailed or transmitted in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section, but not received in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office after a reasonable amount of time has elapsed from the time of mailing or transmitting of the correspondence, or after the application is held to be abandoned, or after the proceeding is dismissed, terminated, or decided with prejudice, the correspondence will be considered timely if the party who forwarded such correspondence:

(1) Informs the Office of the previous mailing or transmission of the correspondence promptly after becoming aware that the Office has no evidence of receipt of the correspondence;

(2) Supplies an additional copy of the previously mailed or transmitted correspondence and certificate; and

(3) Includes a statement which attests on a personal knowledge basis or to the satisfaction of the Director to the previous timely mailing or transmission. If the correspondence was sent by facsimile transmission, a copy of the sending unit's report confirming transmission may be used to support this statement.

37 C.F.R. §1.10(e) sets forth, *in toto*:

(e) Any person mailing correspondence addressed as set out in § 1.1(a) to the Office with sufficient postage utilizing the "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service of the USPS but not received by the Office, may petition the Director to consider such correspondence filed in the Office on the USPS deposit date, provided that:

(1) The petition is filed promptly after the person becomes aware that the Office has no evidence of receipt of the correspondence;

(2) The number of the "Express Mail" mailing label was placed on the paper(s) or fee(s) that constitute the correspondence prior to the original mailing by "Express Mail";

(3) The petition includes a copy of the originally deposited paper(s) or fee(s) that constitute the correspondence showing the number of the "Express Mail" mailing label thereon, a copy of any returned postcard receipt, a copy of the "Express Mail" mailing label showing the "date-in," a copy of any other official notation by the USPS relied upon to show the date of deposit, and, if the requested filing date is a date other than the "date-in" on the "Express Mail" mailing label or other official notation entered by the USPS, a showing pursuant to paragraph (d)(3) of this section that the requested filing date was the date the correspondence was deposited in the "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service prior to the last scheduled pickup for that day; and

(4) The petition includes a statement which establishes, to the satisfaction of the Director, the original deposit of the correspondence and that the copies of the correspondence, the copy of the "Express Mail" mailing label, the copy of any returned postcard receipt, and any official notation entered by the USPS are true copies of the originally mailed correspondence, original "Express Mail" mailing label, returned postcard receipt, and official notation entered by the USPS.

§ 1.134 Time period for reply to an Office action.

An Office action will notify the applicant of any non-statutory or shortened statutory time period set for reply to an Office action. Unless the applicant is notified in writing that a reply is required in less than six months, a maximum period of six months is allowed.

[47 FR 41276, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997]

§ 1.135 Abandonment for failure to reply within time period.

(a) If an applicant of a patent application fails to reply within the time period provided under § 1.134 and § 1.136, the application will become abandoned unless an Office action indicates otherwise.

(b) Prosecution of an application to save it from abandonment pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section must include such complete and proper reply as the condition of the application may require. The admission of, or refusal to admit, any amendment after final rejection or any amendment not responsive to the last action, or any related proceedings, will not operate to save the application from abandonment.

(c) When reply by the applicant is a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action, and is substantially a complete reply to the non-final Office action, but consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement has been inadvertently omitted, applicant may be given a new time period for reply under § 1.134 to supply the omission.

[Paras. (a), (b), and (c), 47 FR 41276, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; para. (d) deleted, 49 FR 555, Jan. 4, 1984, effective Apr. 1, 1984; revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997]

ANALYSIS

As set forth above, the Notice of Missing Parts was mailed on June 7, 2004, and set a two-month period for reply. As such, a response was due no later than August 8, 2004. No response was received.

In the original petition, Petitioner asserted that he submitted a response to the non-final Office action on June 29, 2004. The decision on the original petition noted that the copy of the letter which was purportedly sent to the Office on June 29, 2004 does not contain a certificate of mailing, and that it was not likely that he mailed the application via the Express Mail service of the USPS.

With this renewed petition, Petitioner has indicated that he used a Canadian service entitled "Registered Mail," but is not in a position to be able to obtain a copy of the delivery records.

Unfortunately, 37 C.F.R. §1.10(e) is applicable only to applicants utilizing the Express Mail service of the United States Postal Service. There are only two ways in which an applicant can establish the timely mailing of a communication which was not received, and it does not appear that Petitioner will be able to meet the requirements of either of these mechanisms.

#### CONCLUSION

Pursuant to the discussion above, the renewed petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 must be **DISMISSED**.

Any reply must be submitted within **TWO MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reply should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 C.F.R. 1.181." This is not a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C 704.

The renewed petition should indicate in a prominent manner that the attorney handling this matter is Paul Shanowski, and may be submitted by mail<sup>1</sup>, hand-delivery<sup>2</sup>, or facsimile<sup>3</sup>. **Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter**<sup>4, 5</sup>.

Alternatively, Petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition under 37 C.F.R. §§1.137(a) and/or (b).

---

1 Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

2 Customer Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulaney Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

3 (571) 273-8300- please note this is a central facsimile number.

4 For more than a century, punctuality and due diligence, equally with good faith, have been deemed essential requisites to the success of those who seek to obtain the special privileges of the patent law, and they are demanded in the interest of the public and for the protection of rival inventors. See: Porter v. Loudon, 7 App.D.C. 64 (C.A.D.C. 1895), citing Wollensak v. Sargent, 151 U.S. 221, 228, 38 L. Ed. 137, 14 S. Ct. 291 (1894). An invention benefits no one unless it is made public, and the rule of diligence should be so applied as to encourage reasonable promptness in conferring this benefit upon the public. Automatic Electric Co. v. Dyson, 52 App. D.C. 82; 281 F. 586 (C.A.D.C. 1922). Generally, 35 U.S.C. §6; 37 C.F.R. §§1.181, 182, 183.

5 If, on the second request for reconsideration, Petitioner fails to satisfy the showings burden required: (a) the resulting decision may be one viewed as final agency action; and (b) provisions for reconsideration, such as those at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(e), will **not** apply to that decision.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225<sup>6</sup>. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.5, all correspondence which concerns a previously filed application for a patent must identify on the top page, in a conspicuous location, the application number.



**Paul Shanowski**  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

---

<sup>6</sup> Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. §1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).